

**The TexCom Application****Jose Torres** to: KHoffman

Cc: Philip Dellinger

02/26/2008 06:06 PM

[Show Details](#)

Hello Ms. Kathryn:

In e-mails I recently sent you and other members of TCEQ's UIC staff, I mentioned the fact that citizens from the Conroe area have contacted our Regional Administrator and other members of the Region 6's staff to express their concerns with the Conroe field injection operations that have been proposed by TexCom. Anticipating possible questions from the Region's upper management in connection with TexCom's permit application, now before TCEQ, my Section has considered prudent to learn, with your assistance, as much as possible about what has been done to date concerning this application.

The complainants have specifically pointed to the revisions made to the evaluation of the pressure effects that the injection may cause in the reservoir, and to the timing of these revisions, as some of the major reasons for concern. In light of these events, I would like to start by learning, with your help, about the reservoir pressure effect predictions and the justification for the revisions that the citizens have talked about and viewed as significant. This e-mail is a first step towards achieving this particular goal.

The graphs and tables attached to this e-mail are either excerpts from the application information provided by you and other members of TCEQ's UIC team, or have been developed using this information. Hopefully, these attachments will serve their intended purpose of effectively conveying to you some of what we have learned to date about the proposed project, and may help clarify our questions to you on this complicated project.

The attached file **AttNo01.xls** is a simplified graphic representation of the stratigraphic column for the Cockfield formation in TexCom's WDW-315 (now WDW-410). This graph was prepared with the help of the SP curve in the well log found in Section V rev 1 of the application package, which can be seen in the attached file **AttNo02.jpg**. This graph has proven helpful in visualizing some of the characteristics of the proposed injection zone and potential injection intervals, the location of the cored segment of the reservoirs in this well, and the reported completion interval in the WDW-315 well.

On page VI-15 of the application document, under the heading "VI.A.12 Well Perforations", it is stated that the well was perforated in various sand intervals between 6184' and 6372', for a net perforated interval of 100'. The well schematic in the attached file **AttNo03.jpg** illustrates a set of perforations within this same depth interval. In comparing the above perforated interval with the stratigraphic column in **AttNo01.xls**, it would appear that some 30' of shale were included in the completion interval. It would also appear that some 20' of permeable sand, which could have been included at the top of the completion interval in the WDW-315 well, were not made part of this perforated interval. It all appears to indicate that there is a typo here, or that depth readings based on different datums have been mixed.

Based on the portion of the discussions I listened to during the contested case hearing (CCH) in Conroe, I presume that the reported completion interval for the